REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The claims are 1-8, which have been amended to improve their form. The specification has been amended to insert the Cross Reference to Related Applications and to make certain formal changes to conform the disclosure to the drawings, and to make certain clarifying changes in terminology. The Abstract of the Disclosure has also been amended to improve its form. Reconsideration is expressly requested.

The drawings were objected to because the specification was said to use the same reference character to designate multiple elements such as "horizontal frame legs 8" and "panel 8"; "glass pane 15" and "intermediate layers 15." The Abstract of the Disclosure was objected to because of misspelling and the disclosure was also objected to as referring to "BV" at page 7, line 14 instead of --Bv--.

In response, Applicant has amended the specification to correct these informalities. For example, the reference character of "panel" in the paragraph bridging pages 5-6 has been changed from "8" to --F-- and the reference character "intermediate layers" in the last paragraph on page 7 has been changed from "15" to --16--. In addition, the term "vertical

frame legs 6 and 7" and "horizontal frame legs 8 and 9" have been changed to --vertical frame sections 6 and 7-- and --transverse frame sections 8 and 9--. In addition, the reference numerals 7, 8, and 9 for the profile elements which were not shown in FIG. 2b have been canceled in the second full paragraph on page 7, and "BV" has been changed to --Bv-- in the first full paragraph on page 7. It is respectfully submitted that the foregoing amendments overcome the Examiner's objection to the drawings and the disclosure including the Abstract, and Applicant respectfully requests that the objection on that basis be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 3 were objected to because of certain informalities appearing on page 3 of the Office Action, and claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as lacking antecedent basis for the recitation "the associated glass holding strips" in lines 3 and 4 of that claim.

In response, Applicant has amended claims 2 and 3 to improve their form, which it is respectfully submitted overcomes the Examiner's objection on these formal grounds, and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

The Examiner has indicated that claims 2 and 4 contain allowable subject matter; however, the remaining claims were

rejected on the basis of the prior art. Specifically, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Eichhorn U.S. Patent No. 6,240,685* in view of *Stibolt U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0070370*. The remaining claims rejected by the Examiner were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Eichhorn* and *Stibolt*, and further in view of *Dazo U.S. Patent No. 5,487,245* (claims 3 and 5), *DeBlock et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,546,682* (claims 6 and 7), or *Huynh U.S. Patent No. 7,104,015* (claim 8).

Essentially the Examiner's position was that *Eichhorn* discloses the plate-like cover element recited in the rejected claims except for the welding of a sheet metal plate to a frame element, that such welding was within the skill of the art as evidenced by *Stibolt*, and that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to connect the cover element of the frame element by welding the two together.

Dazo was cited with respect to claims 3 and 5 as disclosing a sheet metal plate facing a web of a frame leg that projects on the edge side beyond the glass pane, and a glass pane clamped between the sheet metal plates. *DeBlock et al.* was cited with respect to claims 6 and 7 as disclosing a sheet metal plate resting on a web projecting into the cross section of the

respective frame element, and a sealing profile arranged between the sheet metal plate and frame element web. *Huynh* was cited with respect to claim 8 as disclosing a gasket serving as an intermediate between a glass pane and a metal plate, a glazing frame made of a metal or other suitable material, and the use of the intermediate gasket to provide the assembly with a water-tight seal.

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As set forth in claim 1 as amended, Applicant's invention provides a plate-like cover element for the opening of a building including two mutually opposite visible sides, which are each provided with a plurality of glass fields, which in turn are each delimited by regions made of a metallic material. The regions are formed on both visible sides by a sheet-metal plate each, in which the cut-outs delimiting the glass fields are incorporated by means of a cutting method and between which a glass pane is arranged which extends substantially over the entire surface of the sheet-metal plate prior to the incorporation of the cut-outs. The glass fields each have a size which prevents the penetration by persons, with the glass pane and the sheet-metal plate being arranged within frame elements enclosing the cover element in

circular fashion. In addition, a sheet-metal plate is welded in an edge region to a frame element.

In this way, Applicant's invention provides a plate-like cover element for the opening of a building in which even in the case of a large number of glass fields the efforts required for the production and mounting are kept low while maintaining the high requirements placed on the door for preventing breaking in and breaking out. With Applicant's plate-like cover element, at least one sheet metal plate is not easily dismountable or removable and may also meet certain requirements concerning resistance to bombardment with projectiles or blast effects as well as fire protection.

None of the cited references disclose or suggest a plate-like cover element for the opening of a building in which regions made of a metallic material are formed on two mutually opposite visible sides thereof by a sheet metal plate in which the cut-outs deliminating the glass field are incorporated. The primary reference to *Eichhorn* discloses a window or a door which simulates a multi-pane beveled glass window or door. Therefore, the window has two support frames between which a single glass panel is arranged. Each support frame is composed of two opposed side members and two apposed end members whereby simulated

muntins are arranged between the opposed side and end members to form a grid.

In contrast to *Eichhorn* wherein the frames are composed of single elements, Applicant's frames as recited in claim 1, as amended, are each made of a sheet metal plate, in which cut-outs are arranged. In addition, contrary to Applicant's plate-like cover element as recited in claim 1 as amended, *Eichhorn* fails to disclose or suggest any information regarding a welded connection between portions of the frame and a window surrounding casement or blind frame.

The defects and deficiencies to the primary reference to *Eichhorn* are nowhere remedied by any of the secondary references. *Stibolt* does not describe a window but rather only a prefabricated reveal consisting of metal for installation in an aperture of a building shell in which the single elements of the reveal can be connected by welding. There is no disclosure or suggestion of the plate-like cover element recited in Applicant's claim 1, as amended, or of a plurality of glass fields each delimited by regions formed by a sheet-metal plate in which the cut-outs delimiting the glass fields are incorporated by means of a cutting method.

Applicant's invention as recited in claim 1, as amended, provides a plate-like cover element with a large number of glass fields in which the element is very solid, especially to prevent breaking in or breaking out. Applicant's plate-like cover element achieves these requirements by being made of two sheet-metal plates in which the cut-outs for the glass fields are incorporated by a cutting method so that the sheet-metal plate arranged on both sides of a glass pane are very stable. The delimiting portions of the glass fields do not have any interfaces to each other because they are created as integral portions of each sheet-metal plate. Therefore, there are no weak spots in the sheet-metal plates caused by interfaces.

Neither *Eichhorn* nor *Stibolt* describe comparable plates. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that even if *Stibolt* were combined with *Eichhorn* as suggested by the Examiner, a person skilled in the art would still not arrive at any useful information leading to the plate-like cover as recited in Applicant's claim 1 as amended.

In addition, *Eichhorn* and *Stibolt* are directed to different technical fields, and it is respectfully submitted that a person skilled in the art would not consider *Eichhorn* and *Stibolt* in

combination. Specifically, *Eichhorn* teaches the imitation of multi-pane beveled glass windows and *Stibolt* teaches an optimized prefabricated reveal. It is respectfully submitted that the technical requirements of these fields are incomparable so that a person skilled in the art would have no reason to combine *Eichhorn* and *Stibolt*. In addition, although a person skilled in the art knows that two elements consisting of metal can be connected by welding, it is respectfully submitted that this knowledge is insufficient to decide that metallic elements of a window should be welded together and in particular which areas of the metallic elements should be welded together. It is respectfully submitted that a person skilled in the art would have no reason to connect a sheet-metal plate in an edge region to a frame element by welding from anything taught in *Eichhorn* and *Stibolt*, or in any other art cited by the Examiner.

The remaining references to *Dazo et al.*, *DeBlock et al.*, and *Huynh*, which have been cited against claims 3 and 5, claims 6 and 7, and claim 8, respectively, have been considered but are believed to be no more relevant. None of these references discloses or suggests a plate-like cover element for the opening of a building having the structure recited in claim 1, as amended, or teaches the benefits achieved by an arrangement in

which a plurality of glass fields are delimited by a sheet metal plate on both visible sides in which cut-outs delimiting the glass fields are incorporated. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 as amended together with claims 2-8, which depend directly or indirectly thereon including claims 2 and 4, which the Examiner has indicated contain allowable subject matter, are patentable over the cited art.

In summary, claims 1-8 have been amended along with the specification including the Abstract. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the claims be allowed and that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,
Heinrich SÄLZER

COLLARD & ROE, P.C.
1077 Northern Boulevard
Roslyn, New York 11576
(516) 365-9802
FJD:djp

Frederick J. Dorchak, Reg. No.29,298
Attorneys for Applicants

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

Fax No. 571-273-8300

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being sent by facsimile-transmission to the Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on August 21, 2007.

Frederick J. Dorchak